



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

city. The book describes the work of the Tenement-House Commissions of 1894 and 1900, and the voluntary citizens' committee of 1898, which led up to the creation of the present Tenement-House Department; but it is far from being a statistical report. It is rather an intimately personal account of the awful conditions which prevailed in the tenement-house districts, with their population of over two millions, and of what has been done, and against what odds, to purge the city. Such triumphs as the razing of Mulberry Bend, the opening of various small parks and playgrounds, the model tenements, the Mills hotels, the vacation schools — all these make a story not often exceeded in interest. *The Battle With the Slum* illustrates many important civic truths, not the least of which is that sometimes a *made* American may be worth a great many of the indigenous variety.

The book is enlivened with anecdotes, and contains many telling reproductions from photographs.

MARY MILLS WEST.

Die vier Hauptrichtungen der socialen Bewegung. Kritisch und vergleichend dargestellt. By BENEDICT FRIEDLÄNDER. I. Theil: *Marxismus und Anarchismus*. Berlin: S. Calvary & Co., 1901. 8vo, pp. xx + 220.

DR. FRIEDLÄNDER, although by profession an investigator in biological and related scientific fields, is not a *homo novus* in the province of economic criticism. In 1902 he published a booklet bearing the title: *Der freiheitliche Sozialismus im Gegensatz zum Staatsknechtthum der Marxisten; mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Werke und Schicksale Eugen Dührings*. Now, following, as it were, the advice "nonumque prematur in annum," the author purposes to give us, in his new book, a carefully revised, enlarged, and modified study of the social problem and its theories. For the sake of clearness and expediency he has reduced the multitude of social-reform theories to four principal types, *i. e.*, Marxism, as represented, *e. g.*, by the German Social Democrats, anarchism, Eugen Dühring's societarian system, and Henry George's neophysiocentric single-tax theory. These four types, no doubt, represent the most important forms of social-reform theories of our time. Nor do we believe that interest in the able critical summaries of the author can be wanting after the tremendous growth, in the recent state elections, of the socialist vote and influence. In Mas-

sachusetts alone the socialists increased their vote from about ten thousand in 1901 to thirty-three thousand in 1902. While the increase in other states is not as great as this, yet it is in evidence everywhere and likely to set people to thinking. There is no dearth of critical books on socialism and anarchism, yet we do not hesitate to count this book among the best of its kind. Following, as he states in the preface, the excellent criticism Eugen Dühring has given on Marxism, Dr. Friedländer shows how untenable, scholastic, and sometimes trivial are some of the theoretical foundations of "scientific" socialism, such as *Verelendungstheorie* (which by this time even the orthodox Marxist admits to be contrary to fact), and the materialistic conception of history. And as to its promise of freedom and happiness, so alluring to the toiling masses, the author's criticism sounds like an extended paraphrase of Goethe's words:

Wie man denn niemals mehr von Freiheit reden hört, als wenn eine Partei die andere unterjochen will und es auf weiter nichts abgesehen ist, als dass Gewalt, Einfluss und Vermögen aus einer Hand in die andere gehen sollen. Freiheit ist die leise Parole heimlich Verschworener, das laute Feldgeschrei der öffentlich Umwälzenden, ja das Losungswort der Despotie selbst, wenn sie ihre unterjochte Masse gegen den Feind anführt und ihr von auswärtigem Druck Erlösung auf alle Zeiten verspricht.

The *laissez-aller* doctrine of the materialistic conception of history is truly branded as fatalistic, unfruitful, and, on that account, as dangerous and pernicious. The inability for positive and constructive social work exhibited by the Marxists is correctly explained as the direct result of their crude and mechanical way of judging and accounting for the forces at work in human history. But by no means is the author willing to admit the great service Marx has rendered, especially to German socialists, in politically organizing the workingmen into such a magnificent body and leading them to what the socialists call class-consciousness. Neither is he blind to the fact that theoretical anarchism has well deserved of society by severely criticising the specific shortcomings of paternalistic socialists. Yet its fundamental contentions, based on an extremely optimistic view of human nature, are cleverly subjected to irony as against a good deal of sarcasm directed toward the Marxists. The anarchist's horror of authority in any form, of the state, and of most forms of social organization is leading to more utopian views and dogmas in regard to social problems than the socialism of Marx. Dr. Friedländer points to the indisputable fact that any decent, intelligent society, especially such a complex one as ours, must necessa-

rily admit the authority of experts, not the least in the affairs of government. This necessity, however much we may regret it, is nevertheless absolute, although totally ignored by the so-called communistic anarchists, like Bakunin, Krapotkin, Tolstoi, Most. The individualistic forms of anarchistic theory, if the term "theory" be not a misapplication, the teaching of Max Stirner, John Henry Mackay, *et al.*, are, quite naturally, treated less *in extenso*. Perhaps it would have been appropriate to make some mention at least of the American Benjamin Tucker, whose doctrines are based on Prudhon's.

But Dr. Friedländer does not aim to be critical only; he professes to be constructive in his review of Eugen Dühring's and Henry George's social theories, in both of which he discovers valuable corner stones for the structure of a future society juster and freer than the one we live in. With great interest we look forward to the appearance of the second part.

The statement, on p. 149, that the weekly *Freiheit* edited by Johann Most was discontinued in 1893 is to be revised. It was being published years after that, and is, I believe, still appearing in New York.

KARL DETLEV JESSEN.

Droit et coutumes des populations rurales de la France en matière successorale. By ALEXANDRE DE BRANDT. Translated from the German by EUGÈNE RÉGNIER, with a preface by GEORGES BLONDEL. Paris: L. Larose, 1901. 8vo, pp. xvi+371.

ALEXANDER VON BRANDT, a student of August Meitzen, describes in this book the hereditary laws and customs of the rural population of France. Before the French Revolution, the farms, according to the laws and customs existing in the various parts of the country, were either equally divided among all the heirs or at least all male heirs, or left to one heir alone (pp. 6, 18-68). The civil code introduced by Napoleon established for the whole country the principle of the equal division of the farms among all the heirs. The economic motive for that innovation was the expectation of an ensuing rapid growth of the number of small proprietors and at the same time an increase of the population. Nowadays many scholars, from Le Play to Bertillon, Parliament, the press, etc., make this same law responsible for the small increase of the French population. The farmers are said to have